G. R. S. 59]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1906.07
(Miscl.)

File No. 8

Serial Nos. 1 — 13

Papers Filed.

Month January 1909.

SUBJECT.

Removal of Stones from the Sri Gopala Krishnaswami temple at Mulbagal to Narasimha Theerta for the construction of a new mantap at the place.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES	LATER REFERENCES
	U. O. 15

Mis. 8] 190 .

MUZBAI SECRETARIAT.

OFFICE NOTE.

File No. C—

SUBJECT.

Complaint regarding the removal of stones from the Sri Gopalakrishna-swami temple building near Mulbagal

From

The Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District.

Letter No. 3071/155, Dated 26th November 1907.

One Sunkada Hanumappa of Golla caste, Mulbagal, memorialised H. H. the Maharaja, complaining that the materials of the Kalyana Mantap of the Sri Gopalakrishnaswami hispanily deity temple near Mulbagal were removed to Narasimha Meertha for the construction of a new mantap at that place, and praying that such materials might be restored to the former institution. The memorial was referred to this Office for disposal under cover of the Private Secretary's No. 2373, dated 20th March 1907.

The memorial having been forwarded

File No. of Muzrai Secretariat.

to the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District, that
Officer has submitted a detailed report clearly
explaining the facts of the case. From the report
it is observed as regards the Sri Gopala Krishna
Swami temple & building generally, that (1) it is
a muzrai institution endowed with a cash grant
of Rs 1-7-3 per mensem; (2) it formerly owned some
inam lands but that they have been clandestinely got
transferred to the name of the Sri Anjaneyaswami
temple at Mulbagal ~~during~~ during the Inam Settlement.
(3) the temple in question is a large and beautiful
structure, portions of which are in a state of
great disrepair; (4) that the temple being situated
at a little distance from the town of Mulbagal,
the temple idol of Sri Gopalakrishnaswami was
removed so far back as 1891 to the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple
at Mulbagal referred to above. (5) that the Archak
of these two temples being one and the same man
he is enjoying the Archak of Rs 1-7-3 granted to the Sri
Gopalakrishnaswami temple and is performing
puja only; (6) though there is no Vigraha in the Sri
Gopalakrishnaswami temple, large numbers of
—, especially of the Gollar caste, go to the
from distant places for making "Hari Seve"

Page ( )

Muz 8A]

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

and tonsure ceremony (7) that the ancestors of the present complainant have repaired the temple at much expense.

Next, as regards the present complaint, the Deputy Commissioner states (1) that one Narayana char, Agent of the Sri Sripadaraja swami matt at Mulbagal applied to the Amildar of Mulbagal in 1907, praying for permission to remove free of cost the materials of the Kalyana Mantap of the Sri Gopalakrishnaswami temple to Narasimha Theertha for the construction of a new Mantap in front of the Sri Sripadarajaswami Brindavana at that place, and that Mr. K. Srenivasa Murti, Sheristadar, who chanced to be in temporary charge of the Taluk during the absence of the Amildar Mr. Puttanna, forwarded the application together with a mahazar drawn up by the villagers to the Sub-Division Officer Mr. Narasinga Rao Purnaiyya for favorable consideration. The Deputy Commissioner further states that he personally inspected the temple in question and ~~[illegible]~~ that he learnt

GPB—3,000—22-6-06

File No. [illegible] of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat.

that the Kalyana Mantap was not in a state of great disrepair, and that the Sub-Division Officer (Mr. Narasinga Rao Purnaiyya) has sanctioned the removal of the materials of the said Kalyana Mantap, free of cost, on his own responsibility without even inspecting the temple and without obtaining the orders of his higher authorities.

In this connection, the Deputy Commissioner also brings to notice that Mr. D.N. Narasinga Rao, has also removed two stone elephants from the same temple in addition to four carved stone pillars from another dilapidated temple close to it, for purposes of the new Sri Anjaneyaswami temple built by him at Narasimha Theertha in the Brindavana enclosure.

In conclusion, the Deputy Commissioner states that both messrs Narasinga Rao (Purnaiyya and D.N. Narasingarao) are not in his District and that therefore he cannot obtain their explanation as to the action taken by them and

Page ( )

Muz. 8A]

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

expresses the opinion that in justice to them for having carried out works of a pious nature, the materials removed by them or under their orders, may be allowed to lie where they are, as no useful purpose could be served by removing them back again to the deserted temple of Gopalakrishnaswami, but that if they had only referred the matter to him, he would have gladly permitted what were feasible without offence to any body -

Submitted.

Before passing final orders in this case, the explanation of Mr Narasingarao Pantulu Garu and of Mr. D.M. Narasimharao, may be called for in the matter of their having, on their own responsibility, authorized the removal of the stones, a copy of the Kolar Dy Comm's present report being forwarded to them thro' the Heads of Depts. under whom they are now serving.

Noted
by 9.1.08.

PTO

GPB--3,000--22-6-06

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat.

Muzrai Secretary's remarks:—

The action taken by the two Assistant Commissioners Mr. D.C. Narasimha Rao and Mr. Narasimha Rao Purnaiyya appears to have been quite unauthorized. They ought to have taken the orders of the Dy Commr. who on his part would have submitted the matter to Govt. I herewith submit two drafts calling for the explanations of the two Officers above named through their respective Dy Commissioners

Subbo to 2nd Commr.

Thamdalam Pillai
16. 1. 1908

approved.
20/1/08

Drafts accepted issue drafts.
21/1/08

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

Note contd:—

The explanation of Mr. Narasingarao Pantulu has been received under cover of Kadur D.C.'s letter No. 346 dt 29th Feb: 1908.

Note of Mr. D.N. Narasingarao is awaited.

Subdd 4/3/08

The explanation of Mr. D. Narasinga Rao has also been received since under cover of the Kadur D.C.'s letter No 375 dt 3d March 1908.

Subdd 6/3/08

Muzrai Secretary's Remarks.

So far as Mr. D.N. Narasinga Rao's case is concerned, that Officer explains that although he got a small temple of Anjaneya erected near the Sripadaraja swami's Brindavana in deference to the wishes of his deceased father, he never intended nor authorized the utilization of any articles belonging to any -- other institution, that he was not aware that 4 stone

GPB—3,000—22-6 06

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat.

pillars and 2 stone elephants were taken from the Gopalakrishnaswami and another ruined temple, and used for his new temple, that he very much regrets such a thing having been done by his subordinates who carried out the work and that he is prepared to abide by any orders that Govt may be pleased to pass. There is nothing in the records to show that any local -- authority permitted the removal of the stone pillars and the stone elephant in question. Mr. D.M.Narasinga Rao himself was not serving in the Kolar Dt, Those that were carrying out the works for Mr. D.M.Narasinga Rao appear to have removed the articles, and how they managed it without the knowledge of the local authorities is not apparent. However, as it is not desirable to allow the continuance, in the new temple, without payment of ~~the~~ value, of the stone pillars and elephant obtained in such an unauthorized manner, I think that their cost may be estimated by the Deputy Commissioner and recovered from Mr. D.M.Narasinga Rao. ~~The~~

File No.	of 190	Muzrai Secretariat

GPB—3,000—25-9-07

Muzrai Secretariat | File No. of 190

amount so recovered may be used for the benefit of the Sri Gopalakrishnaswami worshipped in the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple at Mulbagal.

The next question relates tp the permission granted by Mr. Narasingarao Purnaiya when he was Assistant Commissioner in charge of the Mulbagal Tal for the removal of the 4 Ankanams of ~~the~~ stone pillars &c from the ruined temple of Sri Gopalakrishna swami for their being used towards the construction of a mantap by the public in front of the Sripadarajaswami's Brindavana. As regards this point Mr. Narasingarao Purnaiya submits a long explanation. He says that the Gopalakrishnaswami temple in question was in a dilapidated condition without the idol in it since 1890, that it afforded shelter to men of bad character and that as the towns people and the Sherestedar (Srinivasamurti) who was then in charge of the Taluk were agreeable to the removal of the stones he saw no objection thereto as it was intended for a religious purpose. He says that the ----- --

File No.	of 190	Muzrai Secretariat

GPB—3,000—25-9-07

Muzrai Secretariat | File No. of 190

Memorialist is a petition monger who keeps writing petitions and that neither he nor his ancestors had anything to do with the temple and that his complaint that people perform tonsure ceremony &c in the temple is not true as the temple is a forsaken one without any idol in it. He adds that --- there is no rule directing such matters being referred to higher authorities for sanction. Notwithstanding any definite ruling on the subject, I think that Mr. Narasingarao Purnaiya would have exercised a wise discretion if he had submitted the question to the Deputy Commissioner, who, in his turn would have obtained the orders of Government in a matter which related to the removal of the properties of one temple to another.

The Memorialist requests that the --- stones &c removed from the Gopalakrishnaswami temple may be ordered to be returned to it. On this point the Deputy Commissioner says that such a removal will not serve any useful purpose and that

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat

GPB—3,000—25-9-07

Muz. 8 A]

Muzrai Secretariat	File No. of 190

they may be left where they are. I also think that no further action need be taken in that matter. It is however not possible to recover the cost of the stones &c removed, as recommended in the other case, because, the new Mantap in front of the Sreepada-rajaswami's Brindavana was built by the public who obtained previous permission to remove the stones in question.

In these circumstances the petitioner may, I think, be informed that the cost of the 4 stone pillars and 2 stone elephants utilized towards the construction of the new temple of Anjaneyaswami will be recovered and used for the benefit of the Gopalakrishnaswami, but that in the other case it is not possible to recover the value of the stones removed for the construction of the Mantap in front of the Sreepadarajaswami's Brindavanam.

Orders as above may, it is submitted, be issued and communicated to the two Officers ---- Messrs D.N. Narasinga Rao and Narasingarao .

Muzrai Secretariat	File No. of 190

Purnayya) through the Deputy Commissioners under -

whom they are serving.

431
20.4.08 Submitted to Dewan thro' the II Councillor.

Ellamanchilli Rao

20th April 1908.

I concur.

20/4/08

Ell 20/4/08

6768
22-4-08

24/4/1908

Subd to the 2d C.

Ell 23/4/08

27/4/08

Put up a draft Order

Ell 27/4/08

Ell
Draft sanctioned
GA

Issue Ell

18/5/08.

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat

GPB—3,000—25-9-07

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 8 of 1906

Serial No.

To

The Dy Commr, Kolar Dt
" " Shimoga Dt, for comm^r to mr Narasinga Rao Pay
" Resr Commr at Mysore
" Comptt, Mysore Govt
" Secy to Govt, Genl & Rev Depts
" " " Judl "
" Regr, Chief Court, for com^r to Mr K.M. Narasinga Rao, Subordinate.

P. O No 518 G/ dated 2=5 May 1908.

Conveys the above orders.

No 5192 dated 22nd May 1908.

Endorsement granted to Sunkada Hanumappa of Mulbagal

From,

The Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District

No 3775/446, dated 11th Dec^r 1908.

Reports that the stone elephants and pillars removed from the ruined temple of Sri Gopalakrishna Swamy and from another temple near Mulbagal for the construction of the Sri Anjaneyaswamy temple built by Mr. D.M. Narasinga Rao at Mulbagal are estimated at Rs 115/- and that the D.P.W overseer also considers the estimate reasonable. The Deputy Commissioner further reports that the Deputy Commr of the Shimoga Dt was written to by him to recover the said amount from Mr. D.M. Narasinga Rao, but that that officer states that the amount will be deducted from Mr. Narasinga Rao's pay if Govt so directs. The Dy Commr, Kolar Dt requests in these circs that needful instructions may be issued to the Dy Commr, Shimoga Dt

Submitted with a draft to the Registrar Chief Court.

30/12/08

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—13.5.08

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue
Secretariat.

File No. of 190

Serial
No.

Write a letter to D.M. Narasimha Rao

5.

30/12/08

Attended to
6/7.1.09

Issue D.O. & bring up long next month if no reply is received.

8-
5.1.09

To

Mr D.M. Narasimharao requesting him demi officially to remit the amount.

From

Mr D.M. Narasimharao

States that the amount of Rs 115 was paid by him into the Shimoga Dt. Treasury on 1st Nov. 1908

Draft replied to Dr Kolar in reply to his letter serial no 10 in file up. Noted as desired. Issue
6/1/09 21.1.09

B

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—18.5.06

AV

4367

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Mysore 20th March 1907

R1 No. 2373/1
22/3/07

Petition as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja, is transferred to the Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Mazrai Department, Bangalore, for disposal.

No./2364/06-07

By Order,

H. Whitelaw

His Private Secretary
to H. H. The Maharajah of Mysore.

Mur 8-06 Writ 12

Mur 14]

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

190 —190

From

L. ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq., B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.

To

The Deputy Commissioner,
Kolar District.

Dated
Despatched 15 April 1907.
Received
General No. 4795
Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure No. /

Has the honor to forward herewith memorial registered No. --- 1030/4367, dated 22nd March 1907 addressed to H. H. the Maharaja by --- Sunkara Nanuriappa of Mulbagal complaining that the materials of the Kalyana Mantap of the Sri Gopala Krishnaswami temple at Mulbagal are being removed to Narasimha Teertha by the Sub-Registrar of Mulbagal with a view to

GPE—3,000—21-7-06

construct a antap there.

The Deputy Commissioner is requested to have the matter thoroughly investigated and su mit a detailed report to Government at an early date.

y order,

Fair copy) 7/4/07

S E C R E T A R Y.

S. J. R.

W.O.No.1756 ఇందుకు

నివ్వలసిందని పైన్ చేయబడినది

దీనిలోని వివరములు ప్రకారము

చేయుటకు నిర్ణయించినది.

By order,

Secretary.

Mus 8-06-3

No. 3071/155 Encl: 1 file.

Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Kolar District,
Dated Kolar, 26th November 1907.

From

C. Srikantesvara Aiyar Esqr., B.A. B.L.,
Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District.

To

L. Anantaswami Rao Esqr., B.A.,
Secretary to the Govt. of H. H. the Maharaja
of Mysore, Muzrai Department.

Sir,

Adverting to your docket No. 4794 dated the 10th April 1907, calling for a detailed report on the Memorial addressed to His Highness the Maharaja, by Sunkara Hanumappa of Mulbagal, complaining that the materials of the Kalyana-mantapam of Sri Gopalakrishnaswami temple thereat were being removed to Narasimha Theertha by the Sub Registrar of Mulbagal for constructing a Mantapam therein, I have the honor to report as follows:-

2. While at Mulbagal on the 6th instant, I inspected all the places and made enquiries both of the petitioner and of the leading inhabitants thereof, and with a view to render what follows clear, a brief history of the said Sri Gopala-krishnaswami temple is subjoined.

3. (i) This temple at the foot of a hill to the north-west of the Mulbagal Town, is a large structure, carvings and panels being as superb as several of its kind in the Province with portions in disrepair just as badly as many such ancient temples, the outer walls of the Garbhagudi being also some-what displaced by roots of ficus trees working into the crevices. The temple had been endowed with Inam lands, but

during the ~~Survey~~ Inam Settlement, the said Inams were added on to those assigned to the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple at Mulbagal, with the connivance, it is alleged, of the village servants and the Archak, who at the time happened to be common Archak of both these temples. In the Inam Accounts of Khara, the extent of land assigned to the said Sri Anjaneyaswami temple is shown as 5 candies 10 kolgas 8 padies, equivalent to 23 acres and ~~17~~ 5 guntas, but in the Quit Rent Register, the extent so shown is 10 candies 8 kudus 8 padies, equivalent to 44 acres and ~~24~~ 14 guntas which lends weight to the assertion that other lands, not its own, came to be added on to this temple during the Inam Settlement. Besides the lands so lost to the Sri Gopalakrishanswami temple, it had a cash grant of Rs. 1-7-3 per mensem, which is still being continued to it.

(ii) On the 6th August 1890, on the motion of the then Amildar Mr. C. Seshadri Iyengar and with the consent of the villagers, the Vigraha in this temple was removed therefrom and installed in the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple, under the sanction of the then Deputy Commissioner, Mr. C. Madiah, as the former temple was in disrepair and it was apprehended that the Vigraha would not be safe there, outside the Town and in an unfrequented locality. Since then, the Archak of the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple who conducts the puja of Sri Gopalakrishnaswami in the newly consecrated place, has been enjoying the cash grant of Rs. 1-7-3 also.

(iii) The petitioner, a Goller by caste, would seem to have objected at the time to the removal of the Vigraha, Sri Gopalakrishna swami being his family God and the temple itself having been on several occasions repaired at great cost by his ancestors, but he seems to have been then pacified with the assurance that when the temple was repaired, the Vigraha would be re-installed in its original place. I can, however, find nothing on record to this effect, but the leading inhabitants of all classes and creeds who were present at my enquiry unanimously affirmed that the petitioner had objected to the removal of the Vigraha etc

(iv) Even now, though there is no Vigraha in the said temple of Sri Gopalakrishnaswami and consequently no worship conducted thereat, large number of people and devotees especially of Goller

caste, from the neighbouring villages and even so far from Kolar and other places resort to this temple for making "Hari seva" and also for the tonsure ceremony of their young children and during the month of Sravana when they are said to perform their vows in the neighbourhood.

4. On the 26th of February 1907, Narayanachar, Agent of Sri Padaraja Mutt at Mulbagal, presented a petition to the Taluk Sheristedar, K. Srinivasa Murti, who chanced to be in temporary charge of the Taluk during the Amildar Mr. M. S. Puttanna's short absence on leave at Mysore, requesting permission to remove the materials of the Kalyana Mantapam of the Sri Gopalakrishnaswami temple for building a new Mantapam near Sri Padarajaswami Brindavanam. On the same day, the Taluk Sheristedar had a Mahazar drawn up to the effect that as the temple was in ruins and portions had come down and as there was no Vigraha in it either, it afforded shelter to vagabonds who annoyed and insulted women who had to frequent the drinking water well close by and that therefore the temple should be demolished and levelled to the ground, the Kalyana Mantapam materials being given away to the Mutt Agent free of cost. That very day, the said Mahazar and the petition were submitted to the Sub Divisional Officer, Mr. Narasinga Rau Purnaiya, with recommendation for the free grant of the said Mantapam stones, and the latter Officer who was then on the spot conducting the Jamabandi of the Taluk, sanctioned the proposal of the Taluk Sheristedar, on the 27th February 1907. This order reached the Taluk office on the 6th March 1907, when the Amildar Mr. M. S. Puttanna had rejoined his duty. The said order of the Sub Divisional Officer was, in the usual course of business, communicated to the parties concerned, and while the materials of the Kalyana Mantapam were being removed to Sri Padarajaswami Brindavanam, the petitioner, observing the same, memorialised His Highness the

Maharaja on the 19th March 1907, and the Memorial was sent to the Amildar for report on the 11th April 1907.

5. When the recommendation to permit the materials of an important Muzrai Institution being removed and utilized for another purpose was made by the Taluk Sheristedar, the Sub Divisional Officer Mr. Narasinga Rau Purnaiya should have in the ordinary course inspected the spot, which happened to be just about a few furlongs behind the Travellers' Bungalow, wherein he was residing and then passed orders after satisfying himself as to the truth of the Mahazar and the propriety of the recommendation, and the Amildar Mr. Puttanna could have as well even after orders had been passed by the Sub Divisional Officer, gone to the spot, as he should have, owing to the importance of the subject, verified what had transpired during his absence and seen whether the Sub Divisional Officer's orders could be carried out without doing any harm either to the Kalyana Mantapam or to the feelings of the devotees, and solicited further instructions and orders from the Deputy Commissioner, under the Standing Orders of Government.

6. As matters now stand, I find, from my personal enquiries and inspection of the spot, that the Kalyana Mantapam in question was not in such a dilapidated condition nor quite a detached building as made out in the Mahazar, that a portion of it was actually dismantled as evidenced from the traces of recent demolishing thereof, and that the materials of such dismantled portion were removed to the Sri Padarajaswami Brindavanam and there utilized for a Mantapam. One of the signatories to the Mahazar also avers that the Mantapam was only leaking here and there and that it had not fallen down, and none could instance any rowdyism or assault on women at the temple The petitioner, a religious old man, insists upon the restoration of the Kalyana Mantapam and feels so keenly for demolishing a portion of the temple of his family God for maintaining which his ancestors had contributed to a

considerable extent. But I regret his request cannot be complied with, as there will be nothing gained by demolishing the new Mantapam built at the Sri Pedarajaswami Brindavanam, and getting the old Kalyana Mantapam rebuilt with the materials at a prohibitive cost.

7. In the same Brindavanam enclosure, another new temple has been built, for dedication to Anjeneya, by Assistant Commissioner Mr. D. M. Narasinga Rao, and there are four stone pillars in the verandah of this temple carved with such fine Puranic figures, also brought from another dilapidated temple close by. The Contractor that built this temple was unable to say wherefrom these pillars were got, by one Srinivasa Murti, that superintended the work for Mr. D. M. Narasinga Rao.

There are two stone elephants kept on either side at the entrance to this temple, and everyone present admitted that they were removed from the entrance to the Garbhagudi of the Sri Gopalakrishnaswami temple. The petitioner vehemently urges and prays that they should be returned to the said temple as they were specially got made by one of his ancestors who was returning from Mysore after remitting to the Treasury Irasal in his usual course. No permission seems to have been obtained for removing these elephants. The petitioner is very keen about getting them restored to their former place, but it seems to me, if it could be arranged with him, they may be allowed to remain where they are, as no useful purpose could be served by removing them again to a deserted temple.

8. In conclusion, I have to add that as both Messrs. Narasinga Rao's are now in my District, I have not been able to obtain their explanations, if any, but in justice to them I beg to submit that the works carried out by them are of a pious nature, and had they only referred the matter to me

should have gladly permitted what were reasonable without offence to anybody.

9. The petition received with the docket under reference, and the connected vernacular papers are herewith submitted.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

C. Srikantaraiya

Deputy Commissioner,

Kolar District.

Mus 8-06-4

Muz. 1 A]

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

190 —190

From

L ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq, B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Kadur District.

Dated

Despatched 3 2. 08.

Received

General No. 3433
Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure No

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith copy of letter No 3071, dated 26th November 1907, from the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District, reporting in the matter of the complaint of Sunkada Hanumappa regarding the removal of the materials of the Sri Gopala Krishnaswami temple near Muniyagal. In para 7 of the letter

GBP—3,000 copies 21-9-07

Deputy Commissioner states

Mr Dm Narasinga Rao removed

stone elephants of the temple

question ~~from the~~ ~~of~~

besides four carved stone pillars

from another temple adjoining the

former, for constructing a new

Vinayaka temple, within the precincts

the Sri Sripadaraja Swami Brindavana

of Narasimha Theertha, near Mulbagal.

I am ~~directed~~ directed

request that you will be so good

as to send the enclosure to Mr. D. Na-

rasinga Rao, obtain his explanation in the matter

~~to whether he actually removed~~

~~materials in question, and if so,~~

~~what authority~~, and submit

same to this office at an early date.

The favor of an early ~~reply~~ compliance

requested.

Yours

W/10/08

WM

Inm 8-06-5 2 Pfs

Muz. 1 A]

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

190 —190

From

L ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq, B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.

To

The Deputy Commissioner,
Hassan ~~Kadur~~ District.

Dated

Despatched 3.2.08.

Received

General No. 3524

Muzrai F No.

Enclosure No one file

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith copy of letter No. 3071, dated 26th November 1907 from the Dy Comr Kolar with its enclosures in original regarding the complaint of Sunkada Hanumappa regarding the removal of the ~~materials~~ stones of the Sri Gopala Krishna swami temple near Mulbagal. In the letter enclosed the Deputy Commissioner observes that Mr. Narasinga Rao Purnaiya, when he was the Sub Division Officer in the Kolar District sanctioned

GBP--3 000 copies 21-9-07

removal of the ~~materials~~ stones

the Sri Gopalakrishnaswamy

ple building in question, for the free of cost

~~truction~~ of a mantap in front of

Sri Sripadarajaswami Brindavana

Narasimha Theertha near Mulbagal,

~~thent~~ inspecting the temple and

thent obtaining the orders of his

~~ier~~ authorities ~~under the standing~~

I am ~~to face~~ to request that

will be so good as to send the

to the Officer concerned, obtain

explanation thereon, and submit

same for the information of Govt.

an early date.

The favour of ~~an~~ early ~~reply~~ compliance

requested.

Thanks,

Secretary

4/11/08

20/11/08

Forest Branch.

1907-08.

MYSORE COVERNMENT SECRETARIAT

From D.R.Hutchinson Esquire,

Deputy Commissioner,

Nowgong District.

To The Secretary to the Government of Assam,

Revenue Department,

Shillong.

Dated 29th January 1908.

Despatched 29-1-08

Received 2/2/08

General No. 346

No. 5

Enclosure No. One

Subject.

Submitting the letter of Mr Purnsingha Kro Barua(?) concerning Removal of Stores of Mr Sinclair's Survey Camp from Kalongpar, Nowgong District.

Deputy Commissioner's Office,

Hassan District.

Dated Hassan 28th February 1908.

From,

F.R.W. Wetherall Esquire,

Deputy Commissioner,

Hassan District.

To,

L.Anantasami Rao Esquire B.A.

Secy.to the Govt.of H.H.

the Maharaja of Mysore,

Muzrai Department,

B A N G A L O R E.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No.3524 dated 3rd.February 1908 requesting to obtain and submit the explanation of Mr.Narasinga Rao Purnaiya in regard to the complaint con-cerning the removal of the stones of the Sri Gopala-Krishna Swami temple near Mulbagal in the Kolar District, I have the honour to submit herewith in original letter No.Mis.409 dated 26/26th Instant received from Mr.Narasinga-Rao Purnaiya on the subject, together with the enclosures received with the letter under reply.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

F.R.W. Wetherall

Deputy Commissioner,

Hassan District.

B.S.N.

Enc

Mis 7. 1253/26/27.2.08 encl. one file

1908

FROM Narasinga Rau Purnaiya Esqr B A.

Assistant Commissioner.
On Survey Course Deputation
Camp Bavavar

To
P R. W Wetherall Esquire
Deputy Commissioner
Hassan District.

Dated 20th February 1908

Despatched 26/2/08

Received

General No. Mis 409
No.

Enclosure No. one and one file of V. P.

Subject.

Submitting explanation in the matter of the free grant of stones belonging to Sri Gopalakrishnaswami's (Sometimes otherwise known as Sri Venugopala Swami's) temple near Mulbagal with reference to a complaint of one Sunkada Hanumappa.

Mus Dept

Forward in reply to the Mysore Secretary's reference.

MWW 26/2/08

From

Narasinga Row Pantulu Esqr B.A

Assistant Commissioner

To P R N. Wetherall Esquire

Deputy Commissioner

Hassan District.

Sir,

With reference to your docket No 1408—mis dated 11th February 1908, directing me to submit my explanation in the matter of Some old stone materials—belonging to Sri Gopalakrishnaswami's (Sometimes otherwise known as Sri Venugopalaswami's) temple at Mulbagal, I beg to be permitted to deal with the question, first as it came up before me for disposal in its own official routine and secondly as it has been presented by Mr C. Srikanteshwara Iyer, Deputy Commissioner of Kolar, with my

humble

humble explanation therefor

2 It was early in 1907 when I was conducting the Jamabandi of Avani and Duggasandra Hobles of the Mulbagal Taluk at Hanumanahalli or some village close by that, among other papers for orders and signature, I noticed a report from the Taluk recommending the grant of some stone materials of the said Sri Gopalakrishna Swami's temple to one Narasachar, Agent of Sri Padaraya Mutt who had applied for them with a view to use them for a proposed work of public charity — a Mantap in front of Sripadaraya Swamis' Brindavanam at Narasimha Tirtha near Mulbagal. The report was duly accompanied by a Mahazar largely and influentially signed by the townspeople. The stones applied for were.

were of the greatly dilapidated and
Crumbling Kalyanamantap in the
North-Eastern corner of the Temple,
flushing with portions of the respective
Compound walls. The Temple had been
Condemned, abandoned and neglected;
and there was neither God nor worship
There for over 17 years and nothing again
of archaeological or architectural —
interest worthy of preservation. As it
had further come to my knowledge
that, favoured by its distance from
the town and its situation at a secluded
Corner at the foot of the Mulbagal
hill, some wicked people had occasionally
made it their Stronghold, I Sincerely
believed that the stones applied for,
instead of being allowed to go to
rack and ruin might better be
employed for a religious purpose
in a <u>living</u> institution where they
could be preserved better, and I
approved of the recommendation
from

from the Taluk. Distances are not according in which similar concessions on considerably larger scale are freely allowed to founders of religious or charitable institutions of public utility

As regards the point why I did not solicit the sanction of the higher authorities in the matter, I beg permission to point out that there is no standing order or rule of Government prescribing it. Nevertheless, had there been the slightest doubt or difficulty in the matter, I should not have omitted to submit a report to the Deputy Commissioner. The building was deserted as the Deputy Commissioner himself says. It had ceased to be a temple more than 17 years ago. The previous official records which will later on be referred to in greater detail conclusively showed that no private claims of any sort to the temple existed or would be tenable now. Again, the purpose for which the materials were required by the people was laudable as the Deputy Commissioner's

report itself shows. Hence, I did not feel that I was assuming an undue responsibility — in sanctioning the proposal of the Taluk authorities backed by the wishes of the people. If the question should then be whether the discretionary powers vested in me are rightly or wrongly exercised in this particular instance, it is to all intents and purposes answered by the Deputy Commissioner himself who holds that, had I only referred the matter to him, he would have gladly permitted what were feasible without Affence to any body (vide Dy Commissioner's report para 8). For reasons which it is scarcely necessary to enumerate here, I fear that the Deputy Commissioner, when he went to Mulbagal for enquiry, was not fully furnished with the true facts of the case. Otherwise, there seems to be no reason why he should have been led to make such observations as he is pleased to do, which, however,

however, I beg to explain one by one in the light of my own humble experience.

3. When it is considered what undue proportions have been assumed by this simple affair, it is indeed very opportune that there should be something on record — something uncontroverted and incontro-vertible — ready to hand which helps to clear up so many points at issue. So far back as the 6th December 1890 (and not the 6th August as the present Deputy Commissioner states in para ii of his letter) the Amildar of Mulbagal, Mr. C Seshadri-Iyengar, in his report No 949 dated 6th December 1890 communicated to the Deputy Commissioner that, about half a mile to the north of the Mulbagal town, lay, in a sequestered place at the foot of the hill, Sri Venugopalaswami's temple which had become very much dilapidated, that to go alone and worship god at odd hours, the Archak found it difficult to venture and that, the building having fallen into decay, bad people could freely enter into the temple and walk away with the clothes and jewels used for God and might even destroy the image; and therefore prayed for

permission

permission being granted for the Lord Sri Venugopalaswami being shifted from there to Sri Anjaneyaswami's temple in the town. The amildar concluded his report by adding that the temple enjoyed a monthly grant of Rs 1-7-3 and that the devotees would themselves bear the necessary cost of the performing of Samprokshana &c, connected therewith. Thereupon, the then Deputy Commissioner Mr. C. Madiah Sanctioned the proposal subject to the condition that the approval of the Lord's special devotees was to be duly obtained therefor which also was subsequently done and reported. (Vide Deputy Commissioner's order No 773 dated 23d January 1891 and Amildar's final report no 351 dated 3d September 1891).

4. The amildar's report of 1890 forms a land mark not only important but unmistakable in its character; — important, because it summarised all the available relevant facts which determined the most important order in the case, unmistakable, because there was no Controversy of any kind, the special devotees, the inhabitants of the town and the Taluk authorities being all of the same mind. If Harisēva and tonsure ceremony had

had been taking place on such an extensive scale and the building was thus serving such an useful purposes, that fact should certainly have found a place in the report as one of the circumstances affecting the orders. Moreover, it is a point for favour of your kind consideration that, if such was the hopelessly bad condition of the building more than 17 years ago as has undoubtedly been made out in the report, what it could since have been, especially after so many years of neglect, decay and desertion. Again, if it true that there has been no God or worship in the temple for so long, is it true or at least probable that people still perform Hariséva (హరిసేవ), tonsure ceremony &c, in such a place? I respectfully beg to ask if people are ever found to take a vow to perform their children's tonsure in what is admittedly an abandoned and godless temple. Hariseva might have at rare intervals been performed in the past, but it was not in the temple building but outside it in a grove of trees close by.

5. On the other hand, the Deputy Commissioner evidently declines to endorse the opinion set forth in the people's

maharzar

Mahazar that some notorious
characters had occasionally converted
the temple building into a theatre of
bad and objectionable scenes. Though
I cannot remember precisely what
the people say on the points, yet, I
distinctly remember some persons having
told me, while at Mulbagal, that,
during the Amildar Mr. Seshagiri Iyengar's
time, specific complaints were made
to that officer against some vagabonds
lurking in the deserted building having
attempted to annoy certain respectable
Brahmin women resorting to the fresh
water well which is just behind the
temple. Forgers, thieves and fallen men
and women are said to have occasionally
sought refuge in the temple. One instance
at least is still fresh in my memory of
one Yanadi Venkata Rao's (Shanbog of
Kunnibanda Village) sister or mother having
been thus sought to be victimised. If
these facts could not be confirmed during
the Deputy Commissioner's enquiry, it was
probably because the town had just then
been largely evacuated and most of
the leading people competent to speak on the subject
were

were either absent or were otherwise not made available. Of the theft of Ipoh clothes and jewels and the sacrilege of iconoclasm so clearly apprehended in the Chenildara's report do not afford us a sufficient clue to the truth of official and popular version of the matter as against the idle talk of an irresponsible individual and if the aforesaid facts of knowledge are also not found reported to M. Mulbagal Police, There is at any rate Mr Seshadri Iyengar and so also are the Shanbogue, Patel and other men of consequence whose testimony can hardly fail to bring the truth to light.

6. The Deputy Commissioner seems to think that, when the report was received from the Tiptur Office, I was camping at Mulbagal and that I could have therefore walked up the distance from the Travellers' Bungalow to the Temple and inspected the place before passing the order. But my official journal which I have left behind in that District would show

show that I was elsewhere in a village doing Jamabandi as already referred to Besides, the fresh inspection of the building after the receipt of the application in question was, in my humble opinion unnecessary, as I had more than one occasion to see it during the course of previous inspections.

7. Supposing that the petition addressed to H. H. the Maharaja was not frivolous and really deserved some close scrutiny, may I ask why the same was not referred to me for report or why at least it was not sent through me, but was directly transmitted to the Amildar for report without my knowledge and contrary to all standing orders on the subject.? Had I only been given an opportunity to look into the matter, I would have at once endeavoured to keep the Deputy Commissioner informed of everything connected with the case. Indeed, it pains me very much that, though I remained in the Kolar District for many weeks after the receipt of the petition in

the

the District and even after the same was referred to the Taluk for enquiry, I was nevertheless asked not a word about it till so long after I left it on leave and transfer.

8— Again, the petitioner has got his own tale of importance to tell which he so glibly enlarged before the Deputy Commissioner by referring to the charity alleged to have been founded by his ancestors in respect of a pair of stone elephants and the touching up of a portion of the building for which however, he has adduced not the slightest evidence beyond his own valuable oral testimony. His present story is quite opposed to the probabilities of the case; for the revenue report of 1890 makes absolutely no mention of it; and the entire proceedings only serve to show that the temple was treated as an ordinary Inam institution indebted to no private munificence. If his present story were true, the petitioner would have had greater reason to have made

a written complaint of the shifting of the idol than that of a few stones. Further, it would be interesting if the Government should be graciously pleased to call for the original Mahazar of the Town people and the depositions of the special devotees of the gods, made prior to the shifting of the Vigraha and to satisfy themselves whether the petitioner who calls himself a special devotee or his father or any close relative equally interested in the matter is or is not a consenting party to the transaction. On the other hand, the petitioner is known to be one of the most obscure persons in Mulbagal holding no lands or enjoying no status worth the name. He is, on the other hand, a habitual petition-monger especially in temple affairs, as his petitions about Sri Adianja-neya Swami's temple, Sri Veerabhadra-swami's temple and other temples in Mulbagal are too numerous to mention. When I was once inspecting the old Taluk Cutcherry

building

building at Mulbagal, with a
view to convert it into a Musafirkhana,
he abruptly put on his appearance
and said that no alterations should
be effected in a portion of the Southern
block of the building as he declared
it was his and his ancestors' private
property. His religious proclivities are
generally considered to be of such a
peculiar blend that his moves are
more often taken in joke than in
earnest.

9. Give more points to Subramanya
and I have done.— "In conclusion"
says the Deputy Commissioner "I have
to add that as both Messrs —
Narasinga Rao's are not in my
District I have not been able
to obtain their explanation if
any, but, in justice to them, I
beg to submit that the works —
carried out by them are of a
minor nature and not likely
to be referred to me.

I would have gladly permitted that were feasible without offence to any body." While these observations are sufficiently conclusive as to the disposal of the stones in question, they however seem to suggest that the new Mantap in front of the Sripadarayaswami's Brindavanam for which were used up the stones I ordered is my personal charity as Mr D. M. Narasinga Rao's temple is his. This is indeed a revelation to me and I really do not know how I came to pass for the founder of what in fact seems to have been executed by the public if it is only to be understood as having a reference merely to my disposal of the stones which were of course employed for the work of a 'pious nature' I have not the slightest idea of disclaiming my responsibility in the matter which, I beg to submit, I was induced to take by the sole consideration of public good. By my local knowledge

and

and available records, I was convinced that, in upholding and sanctioning the recommendation of the Taluk and Village officials whose action was fully protected by the public opinion, I was honestly doing just what any body could have done under the circumstances, and that again with the best of intention and in the best interest of the public

10 - The file of Vernacular papers and the copy of the Kolar Deputy Commissioner's letter are enclosed.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,
Narasinga Rau Suryanarayana
Assistant Commissioner
Hassan District

Jmisc. C-06-7.

1908

From The Deputy Commissioner
Kadur District

To The Secretary to
Govt: Revy: Department

Dated 3rd
Despatched } March 1908.
Received

General No. 375.
No.

Enclosure No. 7.

Submitting in original, the Explanation of Mr D. Narasinga Rao re the removal of certain materials of the Sri Gopalakrishna swami Temple near Kulbargal.

XX

Rep: and submit at once

W 5/3/08

Office of the Deputy Commissioner
Kadur District
Dated Chikmagalur 3rd March 1908.

From.

K. R. Srinivasaiengar Esq. M.A.
Deputy Commissioner
Kadur District.

To.

L. Arantasami Iyer Esq. B.A.
Secretary to Govt:
Muzrai Department.

Sir,

As called for in your letter No 3523 dated 3rd ultimo, I have the honor to submit herewith in original, the explanation of Govt: D. No. Narasingarao together with certain enclosures, in connection with the removal of certain materials of the Sri Gopalakrishnaswami Temple near Kulbagal in the Kolar District.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,
A. K. Syed Yasseeran
for Deputy Commissioner

Kadur
29th February 08

Hours 1600

From,

D. M. Narasinga Rau

Received on 4th Inst
3/3

To.

K. R. Sreenivasa Iyengar
Esquire M.A.
Deputy Commissioner
Kadur District

Sir

With reference to your No 1078, dated the 14th February 08, forwarding to me for explanation a copy of letter No 3523, dated the 3rd Febr. together with its enclosure in original, received from the Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharajah of Mysore, Muzrai Department, I beg to state as follows:-

2. With the view of giving effect to my

Mr M. S. Ramadasappa, Sub Registrar (after he arrived at Chickamagalur on transfer about 3 months ago) that the Contractor and Sreenivasa Murthi had appropriated 2 stone elephants and 4 stone pillars of some ruined temples for the use of my building and that this matter along with others had been engaging the attention of the Deputy Commissioner of Kolar. As soon as I heard the information I wrote a private letter to the latter officer explaining my position as stated above and offering to abide by any orders he would be pleased to pass.

7. But I now find from the Deputy Commissioner's report that my explanation is still to be obtained

and I am not sure whether my letter did not reach him.

8. Besides writing to the Deputy Commissioner I resolved not to permit further construction and make payment to the contractor till the questions raised were finally decided.

9. The matter still rests there. I have up to date paid only Rs 300 to the contractor for the work done and materials collected, which do not include the pillars and the elephants in question. Hence I am yet to know what further works have been executed by the contractor and how much exactly I have to pay him. Enclosures V & VI are the receipts evidencing the payment

of plague at Mulbagal, the Contractor
with whom they are, had left the
place and their his whereabouts
were not known. If necessary, the
Government may be pleased to get
them through the Amildar of Mulabagal
and peruse them. The Asst Surgns
Commr's report is herewith returned.
Enclosures I to VI may be kindly
returned to me when not required.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant.
D. M. Narasinga Rau.

Draft as per Dewani orders.
Muzrai 2 Dft
Wlln. 8-06-C

Read :—

(1) Petition Regd No. 1236/4367, dated 22nd March 1907, addressed to H H the Maharaja by Sunkada Hammappa of Mulbagal, complaining that the materials of the Kalyana Mantap of the Sri Gopala Krishnaswami temple near Mulbagal were being removed to Narasimha Theertha for the construction of a new mantap at the latter place.

(2) Letter No. 3071/155, dated 26th November 1907, from the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District, reporting on the above.

(3) Letter No. 346, dated 28th Feb.y 1908, from the D.C., Hassan Dt.
(4) Letter No. 375, dated 3rd March 1908, from the D.C., Kadur Dt.

No. 5185-91 D/23.5.1908

—— ·· ——

Order thereon :—

The temple of Sri Gopala Krishnaswami near Mulbagal is a Muzrai institution endowed with a cash grant of Rs 17-7-0 per annum. H.E.S.

large and beautiful structure, portions of which are in a state of great disrepair. As the building is situated at a ~~little~~ distance from the town of Mulbagal, and as it was not being frequented by devotees the idol of Sri Gopalakrishnaswami was removed therefrom some ~~three~~ years ago and installed in the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple at Mulbagal, ~~where it is~~.

2. As regards the complaint of the memorialist, the Deputy Commissioner reports that in the year 1907, one Narayanappa, Agent of the Sri Sripadarajaswami Matt at Mulbagal, applied to the Amildar of Mulbagal praying for permission to remove free of cost the materials of the Kalyana Mantap of the Sri Gopalakrishnaswami ~~temple~~

to Narasimha Theertha for the construction of a new Mantap in pont of the Sri Sripadaraja swamy Brindavana at that place, and that K. Srinivasa Murti, Shersistadar, who then chanced to be in temporary charge of that Taluk during the absence of the Amildar Mr M. S. Puttanna, forwarded the application, together with a maharzar drawn up by the villagers, to the Sub Division Officer Mr Narasinga Rao Pursuing for favorable consideration. The Deputy Commissioner further states that ~~he had examined the~~ he himself personally inspected the temple in question and found ~~that~~ learnt that the Kalyan mantrapam was not in a state

of very great dis repair and that the Sub Division Off:. Mr. Narasingarao Purnaiya has sanctioned the removal of the materials of the said Kalyana Mantap, free of cost, on his own responsibility without even inspecting the temple and without obtaining the orders of ~~his~~ higher authorities, in the matter.

3. In this connection, the Deputy Commissioner also brings to notice that Mr Dsn Narasingarao, Assistant Commr:., also removed two stone ~~pillars~~ elephants from the same temple of Sri Gopalakrishna swami, in addition to four carved stone pillars from another dilapidated temple close by, for purposes of the new Sri Anjaneyaswami temple built by him at Narasimha Meetha in the Sri Sripadarajaswami Brindavana enclosure.

In conclusion the Deputy Commissioner states that both Messrs Narasimja Rao Purnaiya and Dr. Narasimja Rao are not in his District and that therefore he cannot obtain their explanation as to the action taken by them, and expresses the opinion that in justice to them for having carried out works of a public nature, the materials removed by them or under their orders may be allowed to lie where they are, as no useful purpose could be served by removing them back again to the deserted temple to Sri Gopalakrishnaswami, but that if they had only referred the matter to him, he would have gladly permitted what were

feasible without offence to anybody.

4. The explanations of Messrs. D.R. Narasinga Rao and Narasinga Rao Pirmaiya were obtained through the Deputy Commissioners of the Kadur and Hassan Districts respectively, under whom they were respectively serving, and submitted to Govt.

5. So far as Mr. D.R. Nara-sinja Rao's case is concerned, ~~it is observed~~ that Off. explains that although he got a small temple of Sri Anjaneya erected near the Sripada-rajaswami's Brindavana in deference to the wishes of his deceased father, he never intended nor authorized the utilization of any articles belonging to any other institution, that he was not aware that 4 stone pillars

and 2 stone elephants were
taken from the Gopalakrishna
Swamis and another ruined
temple and need for his new
temple, that he very much
regrets such a thing having
been done by his subordinates
who carried out the work and
that he is prepared to abide
by any orders that Govt may
be pleased to pass. There is nothing
in the records to show that any
local authority permitted the
removal of the stone pillars
and the stone elephants in
question. Mr. D.M. Narasinga
Rao himself was not serving
in the Kolar Dt. those that
were carrying out the works
for Mr. D.M. Narasinga Rao appear
to have removed the articles,
and how they managed it

without the knowledge of the local authorities is not apparent. However, the Govt do not deem it desirable to allow the continuance, in the new temple, without payment of value, of the stone pillars and elephants obtained in such an unauthorized manner, and they accordingly direct that their cost be estimated by the Deputy Commissioner and recovered from Mr. Dw. Narasinga Rao. The amount so recovered should be used for the benefit of ~~the~~ Sri Gopalakrishnaswami worshipped in the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple at Mulbagal. The D.C is requested to report the action taken for the info. of Govt.

6. The next point relates to the permission granted by Mr Narasinga Rao Purnaiya when he was Asst Commr. in charge of the Mulbagal Taluk for the removal

of the 4 ankanames of stone pillars to form the ruined temple of Sri Gopalakrishnaswami for their being used towards the construction of a mantap by the public in front of the Sri Sri-padavarajaswami's Brundavana. As regards this point, Mr. Nara-simha Rao Punnaya submits a long explanation. He says that the Gopalakrishnaswami temple in question was in a dilapidated condition without the idol in it since 1890, that it afforded shelter to men of bad character and that as the honourable and the Sheristedar (Srinivasa Murti) who was then in charge of the Taluk, were agreeable to the removal of the stones, he saw no objection thereto as it was intended for a

religious purpose. He further says that the Memorialist is a petition monger who keeps writing petitions and that neither he nor his ancestors had, as alleged in the memorial to His Highness, anything to do with the temple and that his complaint that people perform tonsure ceremony etc in the temple is not true as the temple is a forsaken one without any idol in it. He adds that there is no rule directing such matters being referred to higher authorities for sanction. The Govt however observe, that notwithstanding the absence of any definite ruling on the subject, Mr. Narasimha Rao Pantulu would have exercised a wise discretion if instead of issuing orders on

his own authority, he had submitted the question to the Deputy Commissioner, who, in his turn would have obtained the orders of Govt in a matter which related to the removal of the properties of one temple to another.

7 As regards the request of the memorialist that the stones re removed from the Gopala Krishnaswami temple may be ordered to be returned to it, the Deputy Commissioner observes that such a removal will not serve any useful purpose and that they may be left where they are. The Govt., concurring in this view, direct that no further action need be taken in that matter. The memorialist will be informed accordingly.

(Swamis order)

W 15708 18/5/08

To
The Deputy Comm., Kolar Dt, w.t. Enclosure
" Revenue Commr in Mysore Encl: 1 file
" Comptr Mysore Govt
" Secy to Govt, Genl & Rev. Dept
Copies to the Dy Commr of Kadur & Hassan
Dto for communication to messrs Dass.
Narasimga Rao & Narasimga Rao
Purnaiya respectively.
" Dy Commr Kadur Dt. for info
" Registrar Chief Court, Mysore for comm to Mr Dass Narasimga Rao, Advocate Encl: 6

Draft as per Dewan's
Mutha 8-10-07
Minute 22/10/07

Endorsement granted to
Sunkada Hanumappa of Mul-
bagal, with ref.ce to his Memorial
Regd No. 1236
" 4367, dated 22nd March
1907, addressed to H. H. the Maharaja,
praying that the materials removed
from the Sri Gopalakrishnaswami
temple near Mulbagal, may be
restored to that Instn.

In reply, the Memorialist
is informed that the cost of the
4 stone pillars and 2 stone elephants
removed from the said temple
and utilised towards the con-
struction of the new temple of
Anjaneyaswami, has been ordered
to be recovered and used for the
benefit of Sri Gopalakrishna
swami, but that it is not possible
to recover the value of the stones
removed for the construction of
the Mantap in front of the

No. 519 W 1907, 7.8

Sri Sripadarajaswami's Brindavana,

as the said mantap was built

by the public.

By order,

Dewan's order) 18/5/08

Secretary

18/5/1908.

1908 D377

From Mun-8-06-10.
The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

To
The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore
Revenue Branch

Dated

Despatched 10th December 1908

Received

General No. 3775

No. 446

Enclosure No. —

Refer
Sd
Cy
16/12/08
VE

Requests him to issue needful instructions to the Deputy Commissioner Shimoga District in re the recovery of Rs 1157- from Rao Bahadur Narasinga Rao, Sub Judge.

3775/46

Office of the Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.
Dated 11th December 19

From

C. Srikanteswara Aiyar Esquire B.A. B.L.
Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

To

K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar Esquire B.A. B.
Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore
Municipal Branch.

Sir.

With reference to para 5 of Government Proceedings No 5785-91 dated 23rd May 1908 directing that the cost of the stone elephants and pillars removed from Sri Gopalakrishnaswami Temple at Mulbagal to Narasimha Theertha for the temple built by Dewan Purnaiya Rao, be estimated

estimated and recovered from him

I have the honor to state that

the value of the said stone

elephants and pillars as estimated

by the principal residents of the

place is reported to be Rs 1157- and

the D. P. W. Sub Overseer also considers

the price as reasonable.

2. On a requisition made to the

Deputy Commissioner Shimoga

for recovering the said value

from Mr. D. Mr. Narasimha Rao,

that officer in his letter No 2236

dated 5th instant states that the

amount will be deducted from

Mr. D. Mr. Narasimha Rao's

bill of Government so directs, as he has not as yet paid the amount.

3. I therefore request that you will be so good as to issue needful instructions to the Deputy Commissioner Shimoga in the matter.

I have the honor to be
Sir
your most obedient servant

S. Shamanna
for Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

G.R.S. 20]

File No. 8-06

Serial No 11

Diary No. of letter replied to 3377

D.O.

No.

General and Rev. Secretariat
( )
the – 190 .

To

Dwn Narasimha Rao Esqre, B.A.,
Subordinate Judge, Shimoga.

Date of issue 12.1.1909.

Signed by Mr. A. S. Iyer.

Mysore Exam Rules

In continuation of Govt Pro: No 5785-91, dated 23rd May 1908, passing orders regarding the removal of stone materials from the Sri Gopala Krishnaswamy and another temple near Nulbagal, I am ~~directed~~ to forward herewith copy of letter No 3775/146, dated 11th December 1908, received from the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar Dt, reporting that the value of the ~~stone~~ elephants and ~~stone~~ pillars removed by the Sri Anjaneyaswami temple built by you at Nulbagal is

over.

SUBJECT.

estimated at Rs 115/-. I am to request that you will be so good as to remit the amount direct to the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar Dt, ~~and intimate the fact to this Office for information, at an early date.~~

~~Secretary~~,
Town Camp
87/09
Mapl.)
4/7-1-09
~~Asst Secretary~~

Copy to the Deputy Commr, Kolar Dt. with reference to his letter No 3775/46, dated 11th Dec 1908.

By Order,

~~Asst Secretary~~
4/7-1-09

List of enclosures,

Copied by

Examined by

Shimoga
16/1/09

Refer
GA

Mz 109 D599
Mz F 8-06-12

Sir,

I am much obliged to you for your kind D.O. letter No 2, dated the 8th instant, calling my attention to the early payment of Rs 115, being the price of certain stone elephants and pillars used for a temple built by me at Mulbagal.

I beg to inform you

that the amount of Rs 115 was paid by me into the Shimoga District Treasury on 1st November 1908 and to state that the report of the Shimoga Deputy Commissioner is therefore false when it says that the amount has not been received from me vide the Note of this letter No. 2336, namely the 5th December 1908.

I request you to be good as to enquire into this misrepresentation which has

done me much injustice by depicting
me as a bad debtr. It ought
not to be so very Easy even for
a Respectly Commissioner to make
a false & misleading report about
a man who has lost little time
in obeying the orders of the Govt.

With respects, I remain
yours obediently
D. M. Varasing a Rau

A. Subramanya Iyer & Bros.

G.R.S. 26

File No. 8-06

Serial No 13

Diary No. of letter replied to ——

No. 789

General and Rev. Secretariat

( )

, *the* 190 .

To

The Deputy Commr.

Kolar Dt.

Date of issue 23/1/09.

Signed by [illegible]

Sir

With reference to your letter No. 3775/1466 of 11th December 1908, I am directed to inform you that Mr. D. Venkatasinga Rao ~~reports~~ writes that the amount of Rs 115 was paid by him into the Shimoga District Treasury on 18th November 1908, and to ~~state~~ request that you will be so good as to get the amount from the Shimoga District and credit it to the funds of the Sri Gopalakrishnaswami worshipped in the Sri Anjaneyaswami

over.

SUBJECT.

temple at Mulbagal.

Thanking

Yours

Secretary

24/11/09

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

MGCPB—20,000-19-12—04